h

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/621,918	07/16/2003	Suresh K. Batchu	SUN-P030062 2560	
	7590 02/08/2008		EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			HUSSAIN, TAUQIR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
	•			
	•		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com hemandez@oshaliang.com DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/621,918	BATCHU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tauqir Hussain	2152				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 December 2007</u> .						
,	,—					
•	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-9,12-17 and 20-24</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-9,12-17 and 20-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	I. C. a. a. dan areast					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		*				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						

10/621,918 Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/28/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/28/2007 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Response to Amendment

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d) (1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: there is no support found in the specification for "computer readable storage media" as recited in claims 17.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "providing security by controlling access to the buffered content for the duration of the device session, wherein only the client device is permitted access to the buffered content", "ending the device session after completion of transmission of the plurality of segment" and

10/621,918 Art Unit: 2152

"invalidating the buffered content upon ending the device session" as amended claims 1, 9 and 17 recite and therefore, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 4-9, 12-17, 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Fishman ET al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0103935 A1), hereinafter "Fishman" in view of Kalish (Pub. No.: US 2004/0201603 A1), hereinafter "Kalish" and further in view of Edwards et al. (pub. No.: US 2002/0069295 A1), hereinafter "Edwards".
- 7. As to claims 1, 9 and 17, Fishman discloses, receiving a request from a client device for content (Fishman, [0048], lines 1-3);

identifying for the type of the client device by processing the request (Fishman, [0047], lines 8-10);

creating a device session associated with the client device (Fishman, [0011], where receiving and sending the content by identifying appropriate transform will obviously require a session);

10/621,918 Art Unit: 2152

buffering the content in accordance with the type of the client device (Fishman, [0047], lines 8-10); and

transmitting the content to the client device in response to request, wherein the plurality of segments is formatted in accordance with the type of the client device ([0052, lines 1-5], where sending is transmitting and [0047, lines 1-4], where customizing is formatting).

Fishman however is silent on disclosing explicitly, wherein buffering the content comprises segmenting the content into a plurality of segments, wherein each one of the plurality of segments is sized in accordance with the type of the client device. Kalish however, discloses, wherein buffering the content comprises segmenting the content into a plurality of segments (Kalish, Fig.5, [0028], where skin page is sliced into plurality of segments), wherein each one of the plurality of segments is sized in accordance with the type of the client device (Kalish, Fig.5 and Fig.6, [0028], where segments are sized according to the device type).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Fishman with the teachings of Kalish in order to provide a method for creating skin images for hypertext languages based pages ("content pages") to be displayed on mobile phone device screen.

Fishman and Kalish however are silent on disclosing explicitly, "providing security by controlling access to the buffered content for the duration of the device session, wherein only the client device is permitted to the buffered content; or "ending the device

10/621,918 Art Unit: 2152

session after completion of transmission" or "Invalidating the buffered content upon ending the device session".

Edwards however discloses, providing security by controlling access to the buffered content for the duration of the device session, wherein only the client device is permitted to the buffered content (Edwards, [0034, lines 2-9], where two way secure session is established for exclusive access to provide a security of buffered content;

"ending the device session after completion of transmission" (Edwards, [0035, lines 8-11], where completion of delivery is completion of transmission) or "Invalidating the buffered content upon ending the device session" (Edwards, [0035, lines 8-11], where upon delivery supplier discards the file".

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Fishman and Kalish with the teachings of Edwards in order to provide a secure access to sensitive material over public network.

- 8. As to claims 4, 12 and 20, are rejected for the same rationale as applied to claim 1, 9 and 17 above.
- 9. As to claims 5, 13 and 21, Fishman, Kalish and Edwards discloses, the invention substantially as in parent claims 1, 9 and 17, including, wherein the pages are sized in accordance with a response size constraint of the client device (Fishman, [0049, lines 6-11], where multimedia files may not be well suited for display on phone or pager means contents are sized according to device type).

10/621,918 Art Unit: 2152

- 10. As to claims 6, 14 and 22, Fishman, Kalish and Edwards discloses, the invention substantially as in parent claims 1, 9 and 17, including, controlling access to buffered response content for the client device (Edwards, [0034, lines 9-11], where secure session authorization by web server is controlling giving exclusive access to buffered content).
- 11. As to claim 7,15 and 23 Fishman, Kalish and Edwards discloses, the invention substantially as in parent claims 6,14 and 22, including, invalidating buffered response content for the client device when a session for the client device ends (Edwards, [0035, lines 9-11], where upon completion
- 12. As to claim 8, 16 and 24, Fishman and King discloses the invention substantially as in their parent claims 1, 9 and 17, including, buffering the content for the client device by using a cache memory (King, Abstract, lines 12-14).
- 13. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references, as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

 Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

10/621,918 Art Unit: 2152

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tauqir Hussain whose telephone number is 571-270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571 272 3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/621,918 Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TH 01/30/2008

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/ Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit Supervisory Patent Examiner Art Unit 2152 February 1, 2008